



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/087,210	03/04/2002	Shinichi Nishizawa	75120-030-2	6903	
25269 DYKEMA GO	7590 03/13/2007 SSETT PLLC	EXAMINER			
FRANKLIN SQUARE, THIRD FLOOR WEST 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005			GUILL, RUSSELL L		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2123		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/13/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/087,210	NISHIZAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Russ Guill	2123	

	Russ Guill	2123					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. Mail The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		cotod ciairiis.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	* **	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		p.i.a.ii iii.a.ii.a.ii.	(
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
non-allowable claim(s).							
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro 		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			•				
Claim(s) allowed:	•						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) vishdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
111. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	1	_				
13.	P	AUL RODRIGUEZ	3/7/07				
		AUL HODTIIGUEE SORY PATENT EXAMIN NOLOGY CENTER 210	0 VEU				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments appear to change the scope of the claims, and would therefore require further search and/or consideration. Claim 16 now recites kinematics software instead of MARC software. Claim 18 now recites both FEM and kinematics software instead of ADAMS software.

Continuation of 11. Claim 1 was amended to recite, "generating a report of the derived spring design". Claim 1 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification does not appear to support, "generating a report of the derived spring design".

New claim 24 recites, "displaying the derived spring design". Claim 24 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification does not appear to support, "displaying the derived spring design".